

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
September 12, 2024, 9:05 a.m. to 3:48 p.m.
WebEx 2499 964 6035

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., September 12, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. Chair Raheem then reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A). A member requested an update from the FERC panel discussion related to CPP. Chair Raheem agreed and added item 1E to the agenda. Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) moved to approve the agenda as modified. Alan Myers (ITC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed the August 7, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B) and outlined action items. John Krajewski (NPRB) moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Commissioner French (KCC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Chair Raheem provided a membership update of Jason Tanner (NextEra - Transmission Business Manager & vice-chair of GIAG) being selected for the CPPTF after Carrie Dixon's exit. Jason Tanner provided a few words of why he wanted to be a part of CPPTF. Chair Raheem provided a FERC Panel overview for the group. Key takeaways from the discussion were underscoring the need for a comprehensive solution to address resource adequacy and interregional transfers. In general, there was a pro-CPP sentiment, but alignment with FERC principles remains a concern so there is a need for a strategic alignment. Early engagement with FERC and building broad consensus among stakeholders was noted as being crucial to avoid litigation risks. A member noted that with the new CPP, we are changing so much of the current status quo process that it is imperative to have consensus that builds reasonableness otherwise we risk litigation. Another member commended a CPPTF member, an SPP staff member, and others for carrying the torch and espousing the positives of CPP at such a high-profile conference and the early education which is imperative to its success.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – NRIS+ REVISION REQUEST APPROVAL

Steve Purdy presented on RR649 – the NRIS+ bridge plan revision request. He mentioned requesting staff comments, which are due on Monday 9/16. He stated that introductory reviews were finished for the following working groups - CPPTF, GIAG, RTWG and TWG – in August and discussion will be held with RCAG this week. No substantive feedback was provided at any of the meetings. This revision request is scheduled for endorsement the week of September 23rd at the TWG/ESWG joint meeting in Colorado; therefore, he is on track for presenting at the MOPC and Board meetings in October. Through discussion, it was determined that the GI manual still

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

needs to be modified and needs cleanup regarding NRIS evaluation. Redlines will be included in comments to post by next Monday, 9/16/2024.

Steve discussed the Z2 calculation issues which included adjustments, stopgap measures, stacking order concerns, and creditable upgrades. Expedited timelines were discussed comparing the current process which has historically been a 5 ½ month study process within a 6-month cycle verses the new plan which will speed the process up to no more than 90 days. Joshua Ross discussed Z2 revenue crediting and stacking system. He mentioned a potential concern with the order of which different impacts are added to the credit stacking tool. He also discussed reverse creditable upgrades.

Steve provided a summary of the stakeholder feedback received on the revision request. He stated that there was a formal response received from Evergy. The main difference was a suggestion that the order of evaluation of ERIS versus NRIS requests be reversed. A member summarized that this is an idea that should achieve expected objectives and make things more efficient. He mentioned that the comments could be rolled out with this revision request or as a revised version of RR626 if the waivers are approved. SPP staff is still reviewing internally. Steve reminded that there are not issues with the comments proposed but just with the timing and the resources needed. Another member mentioned that there is concern that the NRIS+ product will not be available in time to get people the resources that they need. Chair Raheem responded saying that this motion intends to use the queue in the transition study for the short-term considerations and firms for long-term planning, thus the motion is sufficient to meet the needs to allow for evaluation and endorsement of the transmission constraints.

Steve requested that CPPTF affirm that RR649 implements the CRIS bridge plan policy. He also asked if the group wanted to take formal direction to other working groups.

Steve Gaw (APA) moved to approve the motion as presented on the screen:

- **Affirm that RR649 implements the CRIS Bridge Plan policy.**
- **Urge reviewing organizational groups to complete their reviews expeditiously and with respect to their individual scopes.**

Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) seconded, and there was discussion noted. One member still had concerns about deliverability and SWPA placement. The member wanted to consider the decision of not splitting deliverability zones. A note was made to include this in the recommendation report. Following discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Steve recapped next steps: formal comments are needed by Monday 9/16, and the revision request will be going to GIAG on next Wednesday 9/18, TWG on Tuesday 9/24, and RTWG on 9/26 for final input before going to MOPC in October.

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

12-minute break until 11:00a

AGENDA ITEM 3 – 2026 ITP/CPP TRANSITION STUDY UPDATE

- a. Josh Norton began the presentation on the Futures and Siting Approach by recapping the higher-level approval recommendations for the day: requesting endorsement for the use of FERNS data results and the number of futures for use in the CPP transition study and 2026 ITP. He explained the data sources utilized in the study scenarios, including FERNS as the primary source and the others used for input. One member raised questions on data categories, specifically transportation and data centers. The response to stakeholder was that data centers are included to some degree, but hydrogen load was not considered due to high uncertainty. Another member raised concerns about balancing the short-term GI queue considerations with long-term FERNS data. Staff response was that FERNS is primarily used for long term vision while the GI queue is used for short-term vision. A different member commented that he liked the direction with the incorporation of the FERNS data and how to transition in the short-term. He suggested adding language on using the current GI queue. After further group discussion, the motion was made for approving the language on the screen with included changes.

Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the motion as modified on the screen:

CPPTF endorses using FERNS study to initially inform sub regional siting direction (in conjunction with the existing GI queue) and continue to develop siting process for nodal siting in the CPP transition study.

Steve Gaw (APA) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Josh Norton continued with his presentation stating that per FERC Order 1920, there is a requirement for three scenarios every five years, equating to six scenarios every ten years. He stated that the compliance filing will be due next summer, but the CPP 20-year scenarios may not be available initially. As such, Josh proposed that CPPTF endorse the use of up to three futures in the CPP transition study which includes the 20Y assessment and 2026 ITP.

A member asked if the proposal was for two futures for the transition study and up to five thereafter. An SPP staff member confirmed that this was the case. Chair Raheem explained that the CPP proposal would include at least seven scenarios within a five-year period, exceeding the three scenarios required by FERC Order 1920. The same member expressed reservations about relying on semantic arguments for compliance and suggested that doing three futures from the start might be cleaner.

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

There was continued discussion between SPP staff and members with one member urging that the regulatory department be consulted to ensure compliance with FERC Order 1920 and suggested using three futures in the initial study for compliance with FERC. Chair Raheem proposed endorsing the use of up to three futures, with the third future being a delta from futures one and two.

Alan Myers (ITC) moved to approve the motion as modified on the screen:

CPPTF endorses the use of up to 3 futures in CPP Transition Study (which includes the 20Y Assessment and 20216 ITP).

Steve Gaw (APA) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

55-min lunch break until 1:00p

After lunch, Josh continued discussion on nodal siting. He requested a thorough stakeholder review of the data set which can be used for future iterations of what to include in the database. He highlighted the type of feedback that would be beneficial. He explained that the ultimate goal is to have incremental cost for expanding substations to interconnect more generation. He asked what would help stakeholders to determine their best points for interconnection and how we can ask the best questions to get to the detail we need. One member recommended advertising heavily our need for a detailed review of sites with granularity. Another member recommended involving the GIAG group, which was met with agreement from the group. Josh then continued the discussion with land use assessment and development stating that there is plenty of land for development. Several members raised points around land use and development including certain areas within footprints that present significant challenges for siting generation. It was suggested that SPP should look to previous input provided on land availability and asked stakeholders to validate and update the previous input. Josh then initiated discussion that some substations may be more feasible for initial connections due to existing space. A member raised the argument that land availability to reach a substation can sometimes be a significant constraint, not just the space at the substation itself. The same member also shared that the feasibility of generator lead lines to the site can pose a major challenge and urged that the cost of adding a substation be looked at holistically.

- d. The discussion on the technical assessment was moved to the next item due to the presenter's travels. Kelsey mentioned that we are discussing items at the bi-weekly CNAT meetings. He stated that he will provide more in the white paper. The main focus areas in

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

the presentation include: the need for strong technical assessments, model development with an emphasis on integrating economic analysis and addressing generation shortfalls, the importance of deliverability and resource adequacy in future models through NRIS+, the need for clear separation between load and interconnection costs in resource planning, and transitioning to a simple economic dispatch model for better reliability. One member responded favorably to the presentation, including his rationale for FERC. He cautioned that at eye level approach, this is something worth spending time on and resources. Another member shared that there is a struggle within the market to balance the supply side (DISIS) and demand side (ITP), and he sees value in exploring the idea of using economics to address power flow limitations and setting benefit-to-cost ratios. Key takeaways from this conversation include creating a white paper with well-formed recommendations to be presented by Kelsey Allen at a future meeting, develop a comprehensive recommendation for the modified base reliability model, create a proposal for stability analysis, and explore the idea of using economic dispatch to address power flow limitations.

Chair Raheem stated that we have decisions to make for the rest of the day's agenda. He proposed to shift the scope update, DISIS transition, and TOSP discussions to the next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – NETWORK UPGRADE CONTRIBUTION CALCULATION APPROACH

This agenda item was swapped in order with item 5. Chair Raheem wanted to get feedback on the discussion to build out option two. He recapped where the group left off on the entry fee discussion, and then presented the skeleton plan for option two. He stated that it is important to create a balanced approach to cost sharing over time between generation and load, as well as the need for simplicity, transparency, benefit, and predictability. He also introduced the terminology change from "entry fee" to "network upgrade contribution". He established that there is a need for development of criteria for identifying local upgrades and that this information is needed for calculating generator portfolio cost and ensuring economic model efficiency. He explained that ERIS analysis will look at local upgrades while NRIS portfolios will ensure deliverability across deliverability areas. He stated that challenges to this will include common baselines for cost estimates and policy decisions for generator interconnections.

The general communication from members regarding this presentation was positive but with caution to use guard rails, and the need for documentation and rationale for the approach.

Chair Raheem stated that we will keep building this out to help with justification for the cost split. It puts more responsibility on drilling the cost down into the studies once completed.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – CPP TARIFF REVISION REQUEST & FERC ORDER 1920 UPDATES

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

Ramunda provided an update on the CPP revision request timeline and path forward. She stated that the team is making solid progress with developing language revisions in the initial three attachments (O, V, and new one on cost allocation). She mentioned that the team is close to having an initial draft ready to bring to the CPPTF for initial review and that this is targeted for the October CPPTF meeting if we can get it finalized by the posting deadline. She stated that the next attachment that is expected to be brought before the team is Attachment V. She explained that we have some work to do on the new attachment being developed for the cost allocation mechanism and structure. The team still needs input from the HITT C1 decision and will incorporate aspects of the technical assessment once complete.

She highlighted that a FERC Order 1920 update will be brought to the October meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – TOSP UPDATE (DEFERRED TO OCTOBER MEETING)

AGENDA ITEM 7 – WRAP UP, ACTION ITEMS, AND FUTURE MEETINGS

Ms. Russell reviewed the action items from the meeting:

- SPP staff is recommended to prepare a plan - develop a strategic policy track for FERC - to bring back to CPPTF
- SPP staff to continue having discussion on Evergy's proposal outside of CPP proposal
- SPP staff to continue working on NRIS+ in CPP proposal and determine if a long-term plan is needed for NRIS+
- SPP staff to get clarity from the Regulatory team on the impact of the # futures with O1920 compliance within the transition study or subsequent study
- SPP staff will get GIAG input from stakeholders on proposed siting locations
- SPP staff will get more input on the interconnection and siting in upcoming workshops
- SPP staff will keep building out this option to help with justification for the cost split
- SPP staff to send out a doodle poll for responses on meeting the first week of Nov. = complete

There was also discussion about having an additional meeting between the October and November meeting dates. After group discussion, it was suggested to send out a doodle poll for responses targeting the first week of November.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 3:48 p.m.

Attachments: Agenda, 08/07/24 Minutes, Attendance List

Antitrust: SPP strictly prohibits use of participation in SPP activities as a forum for engaging in practices or communications that violate the antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics or behavior that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to, agreements between or among competitors regarding prices, bid and offer practices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.

SOUTHWEST POWER POOL, INC.
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)

September 12, 2024: 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. CT
WebEx: 2499 964 6035 | Password: Xpu8WJuDa83

This meeting will be recorded. By attending the meeting, you are consenting to be recorded.

AGENDA

- 1) **Call to Order and Administrative Items** (20 mins.)
 - a) Administrative Items Ramunda Russell & Sunny Raheem
 - b) Agenda ([Approval](#)) Sunny Raheem
 - c) Meeting Minutes Ramunda Russell
 - i) August 7 ([Approval](#))
 - d) Membership Update..... Sunny Raheem
 - e) FERC Panel Debrief Sunny Raheem

- 2) **NRIS+ Bridge Plan Revision Request (RR649) Approval** (60 mins.).....Steve Purdy

- Break (5-15 mins)*

- 3) **2026 ITP | CPP Transition Study Update**
 - a) **Futures & Siting Approach** (30 mins.) ([Approval](#)) Joshua Norton
 - b) **Scope Update** (30 mins.)..... Joshua Norton & Sherri Maxey
 - c) **DISIS Transition to CPP Update** (30 mins) Sunny Raheem
 - d) **CPP Transition Assessment** (60 mins.) ([Approval](#))..... Kelsey Allen

- Lunch (30-60 mins)*

- 4) **NUC (Entry Fee) Calculation Approaches** (60 mins.)..... Sunny Raheem

- 5) **CPP Tariff RR and FERC Order 1920 Update** (30 mins.)..... Ramunda Russell

- Break (5-15 mins)*

- 6) **TOSP Update** (45 mins.)..... Ben Bright

- 7) **Wrap-Up, Action Items, and Future Meetings** (10 mins.) Ramunda Russell

Future Meetings

Tue, Oct 1, 2024 (9a-4p) WebEx

Mon, Nov 18, 2024 (9a-4p) WebEx

Fri, Dec 6, 2024 (9a – 4p) WebEx

**SOUTHWEST POWER POOL (SPP)
CONSOLIDATED PLANNING PROCESS TASK FORCE (CPPTF)
August 7, 2024, 8:09 a.m. to 4:40 p.m.
WebEx 2483 633 7548**

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEM 1 – CALL TO ORDER AND ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Chair Sunny Raheem called the meeting to order at 8:09 a.m., August 7, 2024, with a quorum present. Ramunda Russell provided an overview of meeting procedures and read the antitrust statement. There were no proxies recorded for this meeting. Chair Raheem reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment A). Commissioner French (KCC) moved to approve the agenda as presented. John Krajewski (NPRB) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. Ms. Russell reviewed the July 22, 2024, draft meeting minutes (Attachment B) and outlined action items.

John Krajewski (NPRB) moved to approve the previous meeting's minutes. Alan Myers (ITC) seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – CRIS REVISION REQUEST PREVIEW

Steve Purdy provided a draft of the CRIS revision request for stakeholder review and input. He reviewed the schedule and explained that he was planning to post the revision request for comments by next Wednesday. If comments were provided during this time, he could make changes without having to go through the formal change process once posted. He targeted a goal of getting this to October MOPC and the Board for approval on October 29, 2024, since this was a recommendation related to HITT. The plan is for this to be stood up by the end of the year. He recapped that the NRIS+ bridge plan was previously approved. He mentioned that there are three different areas of Attachment V that will be impacted (App. 3, Sect. 5, Sect. 8.2), and changes will be required to the GI manual. There were some questions and group discussion on terms and definitions. Steve provided an overview of the expedited process of what the customer would go through to designate a NRIS unit without going through an aggregate study. Steve mentioned the internal discussions that were had regarding Z2. He stated that for new NRIS requests that go through the GI process, we would provide an analysis of Z2 impacts by a future designation and provide an estimate of what credits will be. Once the customer goes through with the designation process, they will submit the Z2 agreement and SPP will study the impact from that resource to that specific load. SPP will provide information to the customer and will allow them to withdraw if decided. We factored in a 90-day advance to go through check boxes and do Z2 analysis. Steve explained that existing generators transitioning to NRIS+ would be included in one of

three buckets: existing generators with GIA's included in the transition study, requests within the queue in the process of being studied, and the requests that have not been submitted yet. The revision request will cover the first two buckets. He explained that the resource deliverability amounts and deliverability areas will be included in one central source of information for the network resource deliverability amounts. There was some discussion on how this document would look. Steve then outlined the new NRIS requests submission and evaluation process. He stated that the deposits will be based on the maximum injection capability as well as the financial security, which is consistent with FERC's policy guidance in Order 2023. Steve outlined what the GIA will include, and then he listed which customers would be affected on the effective date of the revised GI transition procedures. He explained that we plan to have discussions with various groups this month and prepare to go to MOPC for approval in October. One member was concerned about having deliverability areas changed and tracking this in the GIA, which would lead to a lot of administrative burden on the GIA's. There were questions and some discussion regarding the different types of customers and if grandfathered generation would have to submit an agreement. Another member stated that he will mark up the document with his comments. He mentioned that given the Board action to delay the open window, we want to set ourselves up for success with transitioning the DISIS. He stated that we need to do this in tandem with the NRIS study and asked if this needed to be added into a business practice. Steve stated that there is not a dramatic change, and we will not be using the DC analysis. Chair Raheem confirmed that we are posting for comments on August 14, so he requested that they be provided by that time. Chair Raheem recapped action items from this discussion. An SPP member confirmed that the GIA is required for initiating or requesting firm service; it is business practice 7500.

10-min break until 9:24a

AGENDA ITEM 3 – TRANSITION DISIS TO CPP

Chair Raheem stated that there was discussion at the Board on the DISIS 2024/2025 waiver approach. This was about bringing in study assumptions to the CPP proposal to see how the existing DISIS will tie into this approach. We need to have good assumptions to have a good foundation to establish forward-looking entry fee amounts. He listed the two options for the study that were discussed last time - having a standalone study or expanding the scope of the CPP transition study. He outlined the benefits and challenges of each. He explained a high-level comparison of the two study options in key areas. One member stated that the restudy risk in the transition study approach seemed lower. Chair Raheem responded that it would be lower depending on the siting approach. Another member asked how the studies would be different, and there was a great deal of discussion on this. The questioning member stated a preference for option two but was concerned that we would miss an opportunity to do something sooner rather than later if we waited to file the entry fee next

year. A different member stated that we have a chance for more FERC pushback with option two, and another member agreed. Chair Raheem stated that we had an action item to review the GIAG poll results to bring back to this group. He claimed that it was a little surprising that limiting resources was the most important area of focus. This provided confirmation that both groups are leaning towards the same areas. The CPPTF poll results showed that the majority agreed with the GI certainty concern. He observed that many did not vote but thinks that it was because this was a new concept, and many were still wrapping their heads around this. He listed the open feedback that was captured from the last poll question and placed comments in four main categories. Chair Raheem summarized the challenges and solutions of the transition study. He then forecasted how many more restudies we would have to provide certainty under the dark green box and additional analysis that would be performed in upcoming studies. He explained a high-level flow of the DISIS process with a waterfall effect of results feeding into the subsequent phases. He then provided an overview of how to perform the siting process. There was discussion on why we were using an energy metric instead of a capacity metric for a storage unit. It was suggested that we need more clarity on renewable calculation basis. Chair Raheem moved on to summarize that the customer dropout rate is 45 - 55% for each DISIS study and expect that this will continue for those that have high-cost assignments. He stated that we expect some to still drop out based on the cost assignment coming out of our study. He noted that Future 2 totals include spot load additions from resiliency conditions. There was discussion on developers signing agreements with upgrade costs and the associated withdrawal risk. Chair Raheem outlined the assumptions used to develop option two of the study. He summarized the goals for option two and listed out the key decisions needed. He stated that our option under this approach was the entry fee recommendation that would carry over to the CPP process. He outlined the three stages of the CPP filing to determine the assumptions that will be included in the transition study. There was group discussion on what to include in the base model and the dependency of solutions on the GIA. Chair Raheem stated that we need to decide if we will honor high-cost assignments out of GIA. He stated that we are factoring in cost assignment into the ITP process. Chair Raheem mentioned that we may want to look at a lower cutoff point at the average cost of \$65/kW vs. the \$125/kW ceiling. There was a lot of group discussion on the timing of when to add in upgrades. An SPP member suggested that we may need to identify if there is another point in which to include the upgrades. One member stated that an important piece is to include a larger pool of resources that are less certain and have more site selection inclusion criteria on which to build, and another member agreed.

15-min break until 11:25a

After break, Chair Raheem started discussing requests not at DP2 and when they could convert to CPP. He summarized the problem statement (what consideration will be given to

land use analysis and what will be factored into the transition study) and the siting modification recommendation. He outlined the two policy decisions to be made: make a recommendation on whether we are ready to move forward with option two which will be incorporating into the transition study and which DISIS the entry fee applies to, which could be 2024 and if CPP is delayed, it would also apply to 2025. Chair Raheem asked for input from the developers on if we should put the shared network upgrade agreement in DP2. Concerns were shared regarding pushback from FERC and the approval timeline. There was discussion on the timing of finalizing the model set to keep the 2026 ITP on schedule. There was an update provided on the FERNS study and an explanation of what the data will provide as well as how to incorporate it. Chair Raheem asked the group if they were ready to narrow down to one study option. One member stated his preference of option two because it is a blended approach with CPP and the FERC filing process. He declared that voting on this option will allow us to make quick decisions on simple items and then select items that need more discussion. Another member agreed, but believed there is more needed on the DISIS blending. The suggestion was made to move forward with a motion.

Motion	Outcome
Motion Language	I move to approve the draft motion regarding further development of option two as displayed on slide 5 and eliminating the development of option one.
Motion	S Gaw
Second	A Myers
Discussion	A Myers stated that we needed to hash out more details to move forward with CPP alignment. His concern was the risk around option one. Chair Raheem stated that this would push us to make a determination on entry fee.
Vote - In favor	All
Vote - Opposed	None
Vote - Abstain	None

Motion passed. Chair Raheem stated that before the September meeting, we would develop option two for the study in a paper and vote on the details of this section of the scope.

50-min lunch break until 1:00p

After returning from lunch break, Chair Raheem wanted to determine if the group was comfortable with the three stages to build out the recommendation. One member asked for clarification on if Chair Raheem wanted to vote on the structure and then how to handle them. This structure would be used to build out the recommendations. Another member asked when there would be decisions made. Chair Raheem confirmed that this would be needed by the September meeting. The first member asked if we were firm enough on stage one to move forward with a recommendation so we can plan on further discussion for the other two stages. Chair Raheem asked if there was more discussion needed on stage one. There was no response. He stated that we now have direction on this item, and no motion was needed.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – ENTRY FEE DISCUSSION

Chair Raheem recapped where we left off on the entry fee discussion. He stated that we will need to file the entry fee as part of the revision request. He showed the system split calculation that was in the entry fee framework document. He noted that more than half of firm service going through the aggregate study can get base plan funding up to the Safe Harbor limit. He stated that we wanted feedback on the entry fee methodology approach. He briefly covered the cost split and stated that the majority of upgrades in the expansion plan are base plan funded.

He reminded of the cost allocation rules that we have - we are blending the DISIS GI process with the ITP process, which have different cost objectives. He stated that we are trying to find a way to setup the entry fee early. He outlined the potential approach and identified the three main challenges. One member was concerned with higher transmission cost and not energy cost. Another member was concerned about if we have base funded everything now and may not need as much, if we needed some normalization so we wouldn't end up with a low baseline after the cost spent in the transition study. A different member stated that we should align with FERC Order 1920 benefit metrics as much as possible to put us in a good position with FERC. A member confirmed that the long-term solution is CPP, but we still need to focus on the near-term ITP. Chair Raheem outlined the system split calculation and stated that the adjustment factor is the multiplier. He claimed that this proposed approach is within tolerance for what we believe is success. There was discussion about the average cost number used and wanted confirmation that the number is skewed and is also based on historical and not future. There was explanation of the JTIQ calculation. One member stated that the cost recovery is truly 30 - 50% higher and the comparison of cost is not accurate, and he is concerned that we are creating incentives for a dead zone. Another member

offered that the JTIQ approach could be problematic. A different member touched on firm vs. non-firm distinction and wanted to make sure that this is clear for FERC compliance filing. There was a question about the 50/50 split being used, and there was a response that this split could price everyone out while the 70/30 split is a snapshot that is a rough estimate from the ITP data reference. There was group discussion on being detailed in our filing next spring and whether we were on the right track. A few members agreed, while others are concerned about the calculation. A suggestion was made to develop a framework that will show savings instead of a generation and load portfolio and use this to justify a cost savings vs. a generation/load benefit to take to FERC. A member explained the system split idea and suggested that we use the transmission construction as a baseline for the cost split and use the remaining 30% to meet everyone's needs. Another member stated that SPP needs to take into account the "roughly commensurate" number from a litigation standpoint and be prepared to ensure that we address the standard. A third member is concerned that he will be paying twice: JTIQ and entry fee. Chair Raheem stated that we need to identify a list of calculations. We need to determine a split, and it may be done multiple ways. He suggested that we list out the calculations after break so staff can begin moving forward.

15-min break until 2:38p

Chair Raheem resumed the meeting with the group outlining calculation approaches in lieu of the system split. There was group discussion with one member proposing that we need two separate lists (NRIS+ list based on RA needs of LRE's and others interconnecting that may not get there on being designated). He also suggested that we solve for ensuring deliverability in year 5 and year 10 for LRE's to get ahead of doing transmission to deliver LRE requirements (identify data inputs and final outcomes and what develops a portfolio). Chair Raheem stated that we must at least have the methodology for the filing, but don't know how we can proof test it if we don't have numbers. Another member suggested a more forward-looking way to calculate the system split by doing it after the resource plan. There was a lot of group discussion between members and SPP members. One member suggested a test number to make people feel more comfortable. Chair Raheem stated that we have enough to put together a draft calculation internally based on group input, and an SPP member agreed. A member suggested developing a FERC Order 1920 benefits approach. The SPP member stated that we need to layout all of the benefits. Chair Raheem stated that the big challenge is doing this by the new siting approach. He confirmed that SPP would work on other approaches and bring back to the September meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – 2026 ITP/CPP TRANSITION ASSESSMENT

- b. Sherri Maxey shared the overview of the initial scope outline and requested feedback on any noted gaps. She stated that a couple of items were added under the MEM. A new item was included for HVDC considerations. One member flagged three items for consideration: deliverability in NRIS+ zones and if we should ensure resource adequacy needs as part of transmission services (do we move forward with CRIS transition study upgrades?), whether congestion hedging modeling will change, and if FERC Order 1920 is included. An SPP member asked what our gameplan is for the first CPP cycle and if we know what we will include in the next three annual assessments. He stated that we would stick to futures and reliability scenarios for the 2028 and 2029 assessments (as #2 and #3 of the first CPP cycle). Chair Raheem stated that the 2027 assessment would likely be reliability only because we can't apply an entry fee to the 2027 timeline. A member mentioned that this will emphasize the point that NTC's should be considered out of the transition study. Sherri will add these comments to future internal conversations and meetings to continue developing the language. Another member mentioned that we should add where we need waivers in the deliverables. Chair Raheem mentioned that we can include, where applicable, in the scope.

- a. Joshua Norton led the futures and siting approach discussion. He explained what the FERNS data will include and shared the timeline of when data is expected to be taken to ESWG. He listed the three data demands and showed that the main data source is the EIA. He outlined options for determining the number of futures. One member asked for clarification on the use of two or three futures. There was clarification that after the transition study, it is open to multiple futures with a minimum of three every three years. The suggestion was made to adjust the first bullet in the green area to say that there would be two futures for the transition study. Joshua reviewed the seven "categories of factors" regulations to be included and stated that a drivers table for futures will be developed to include in the scope. He showed what would be pulled from our data sources to use in the CPP transition study. We need to determine where the resources will be placed within the zones and define what we want to receive and what would be helpful. One member asked which group would be taking the lead on the stakeholder review. Joshua responded that the ESWG has been reviewing this for the ITP. The member agreed with continuing to have ESWG to lead the effort. Joshua continued with showing the table for the zonal level within the scope. One member warned against placing a wall with the LOLE zones and is concerned that we reinforce constraints because we aren't creating flow across the zones. Another member countered the point by not wanting to limit expansion but recognizing the constraints in place today to optimize the existing futures system. A different member stated that we should make optimal use of the FERNS study to break down constraints within the footprint if it is developed as advertised. An SPP member agreed that the FERNS data will be the best look that we have had and stated that we have plans to check the FERNS numbers. He

explained that we have a point of interconnection demand in the current GI plan and will use it to perform a check of the granularity scope. A concern was raised about national databases and generalized scoring being used within the FERNS study and stated that we need more granularity in each state or zone. Joshua outlined three options for how to allocate a subregional entry fee. One member suggested that allocating evenly per MW should be the goal. He stated that when determining the applicability of the entry fee, we should have analytics to support - look at flow across facilities to determine eligibility and allow for flexibility for changes in the 20Y assessment. Another member agreed and added that transparency in where to interconnect would be a plus but was not sure if a screening study would help with this. The first member added that being too specific on where to forecast will defeat the purpose, and we need to make sure that there is engineering analysis or enough flexibility built into the entry fee. Another SPP member stated that we need to hone in on the definition of suboptimal and electrical equivalence. He proposed that we need to get to where we are applying the same entry fee to all customers in the region and to align with the structure of five entry fees to five subregions.

Chair Raheem stated that we should add the remaining three items to the CNAT meeting for discussion and guidance. The last item for CPP technical approach would be discussed in tomorrow's CNAT meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – WRAP UP AND ACTION ITEMS

Chair Raheem and Ms. Russell reviewed the upcoming meeting dates (noting the September meeting change from in-person to web conference due to the FERC workshop taking place on September 10 – 11, 2024) and action items from the meeting:

- Steve will send a link to GlobalScape out to the group for the transition study results for NRIS+ (item 2). = complete
- SPP will look at light load case and how it's applied to deliverability amounts - pick up in 2026 ITP discussion
- SPP to follow-up on request to verify if there is a concern with sharing the interconnection contacts prior to having the GIA executed (item 3)
- SPP to see if there is another point in which to include the upgrades
- SPP to develop option 2 for the special study in a paper and vote on the details of this section of the scope in the September meeting

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Raheem adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Attachments: Agenda, 07/22/24 Minutes, Attendance List

CPPTF ATTENDANCE LIST, SEPTEMBER 12, 2024

Attendance list from WebEx registration & In-Person. Symbols: * denotes CPPTF Member and † denotes proxy.

#	Name	Organization
1	Sunny Raheem (Chair)*	SPP
2	Alan Myers*	ITC
3	Andrew French*	KCC
4	David Mindham*	EDPR
5	Derek Brown*	Evergy
6	Heather Starnes*	MJMEUC
7	Jarred Cooley SPS*	SPS
8	John Krajewski*	NPRB
9	Steve Gaw*	APA
10	Ramunda Russell (Secretary)*	SPP
11	Jason Tanner*	NextEra
12	Adam Schieffer	OPPD
13	Afshin Salehian	SPP
14	Andrew Daro	NPPD
15	Angie Anderson	Sunflower
16	Annie Minondo	NRDC
17	Austin Morman	SPP
18	Ben Bright	SPP
19	Bernie Liu	Xcel
20	Brad Cochran	OGE
21	Brad Lafler	CES
22	Brenda Fite	SPP
23	Brian Rounds	AESL
24	Bridget Sparks	AES
25	Jim Krajecki	CES
26	Call-in User_2	
27	Call-in User_3	
28	Call-in User_4	
29	Calvin Daniels	WFEC
30	Casey Cathey	SPP
31	Charles Locke	SPP
32	Chris Cranford	SPP

33	Chris Jamieson	SPP
34	Christopher Lyons	CES
35	Chris Stolz	PGR
36	Cindy Ireland	Ark.gov
37	Clifford Franklin	Sunflower
38	Conf 1F Room 117	SPP
39	Conor McKenzie	AEU
40	Deni Golden	SPP
41	Denise Buffington	Evergy
42	Denise Martin	SPP
43	Dennis Reed	MWRC
44	Derek Sunderman	SE
45	Diana Gastelum	GPISD
46	Don Frerking-SPP	SPP
47	Doug Kouskouris	AEP
48	Gayle Freier	SPP
49	Greg Wannier	SC
50	Ibrahima Kalle	Leidos
51	Jason Chaplin	OCC
52	Jennifer Swierczek	SPP
53	James Hotovy	NPPD
54	John Knofczynski	East River
55	John O'Dell	SPP
56	Jonathan Goldsworthy	ITC
57	Jonathan Lubobo	BEPC
58	Joshua Ross	SPP
59	Joshua Norton	SPP
60	Justin Grady	KCC
61	Kalun Kelley	WFEC
62	Kelsey Allen	SPP
63	Kirk Hall	SPP
64	Lee Elliott Invenergy	INVENERGY
65	Loren Ditsch	OPPD
66	Lottie Jones	SPP
67	Maggie Kristian	NGR
68	Marisa Choate	SPP
69	Megan Damron	SPP
70	Michael Wegner	ITC
71	Natasha Henderson	SPP
72	Naved Khan	SPP

73	Nick Abraham	ITC
74	Nicole Wagner	SPP
75	Nigel Dunham	ACE
76	Nikki Roberts	SPP
77	Oluwabusola Fagbemi	Aneden
78	Paul Antony	GA
79	Philip Westby	BEPC
80	Lane Sisung	Sisung
81	Robert Pick	NPPD
82	Ryan Benton OG&E	OG&E
83	Shawn Welch	Doral
84	Shawnee Claiborn-Pinto	PUCT
85	Sherri Maxey	SPP
86	Shilpi Sunil Kumar AES CE	ASE CE
87	Simon Cherucheril	PGR
88	Steve Purdy	SPP
89	Tammy Bright	SPP
90	Tom Michelotti	NW
91	Tyler Berton	AES
92	Vaibhav Bilagi	RWE
93	Walt Shumate	SBC Global
94	Kenneth Wei	NextEra
95	Jeff Wells	NextEra